



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

much of the manufacture of books, never mentions the *umbilicus*. Greek literature knows nothing of it (them) till the second Christian century. Only the Roman poets speak of it (them), and that too only when they are speaking of unusual volumes, such as presentation copies. "Grade sie bewiesen, dass der *umbilicus* im Lesebuch nicht das Gewöhnliche war". In Catullus 22 Suffenus shows himself by various things, among which are *novi umbilici* (7), "eitle Narr". Birt notes next that the works of art figured and discussed in his book give no hint whatever of the *umbilicus*.

In support of his doctrine that the *umbilicus* was not attached to the roll, but only laid in the roll when it was complete to form a solid center for the rolled-up volume, Birt quotes Porphyrio on Horace Epod. 14.8: in fine libri umbilici ex ligno aut osse solent poni; the verb used, it will be noted, is *poni*, not *aptari* or *adsui* or *agglutinari*. So Lucian, *Adversus Indoctum* 16, in a similar connection has the phrase *ὀμφαλοῦς ἐντιθέσθαι*; the verb *ἐντιθέσθαι* is used, for example, of putting one's foot in a shoe. When one began to read, he left the *umbilicus* in its original place, or else pulled it out with his left hand and then wrapped around it the part of the book he had read.

Birt then argues that his explanation of the *umbilicus* as something detachable helps us at last to explain Catullus 22. Suffenus has an epic poem in 10,000 verses. This he carries about in ten scrolls, of new paper of the best sort; for these he uses *novi umbilici*, one for each volume. "Als besondere Luxus gilt hier, dass der Dichter sogar 'neue' Stäbchen nimmt". It follows that ordinarily people were content to use old *umbilici*; they took the light *umbilici* out of old scrolls and put them into new volumes. Finally, from all this we see why the *umbilicus* was usually of gay colors or gilded. Such coloring or gilding would have been needless if the *umbilicus* were permanently attached to the scroll; in that case it would be entirely hidden from view (as the stick was hidden in our Horatian scroll). "Er lag vielmehr oft frei in der Hand" (the left hand).

The evidence for the use of two *umbilici* begins with Statius, *Silvae* 4.9.8; it is given more fully by Martial. Birt holds that his theory of the use of the two *umbilici* (see Professor Post, quoted above) at last makes it possible to explain Martial 5.6.15: *nigris pagina crevit umbilicis*. *pagina* here denotes the whole volume; this is in fact small (see verse 7), but it has grown "durch die beiden Stäbe; man meint, das Buch sei so stark an Papier; aber die Stäbe sind es, die es so aufblähen. Sie stecken beide im Innern". To realize the value of Professor Birt's discussion of the *umbilicus* one has only to examine the commentaries on Catullus and Martial or Vollmer's note on Statius, *Silvae* 4.9.8, or the unsatisfactory account on page 47 of the

new edition of E. Maunde Thompson's *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Oxford Press, 1912).  
C. K.

#### LATIN PROSE COMPOSITION IN COLLEGE

The keen satisfaction with which I read in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.26-29 Dr. Mitchell's paper on The Teaching of Latin Prose Composition in the Secondary School has moved me to set down certain ideas and convictions concerning Latin prose composition in College, particularly prescribed Latin prose composition.

What of those students who would not *sua sponte* elect Latin prose composition? Are those teachers right who believe that they should be allowed to omit such a course? That belief may be a natural product of long and wearisome experience of prescribed composition with large, heterogeneous classes, containing every possible type of mind, from that of the thoroughly prepared student with a natural language sense and an industrious disposition, to a feather-weight product of an utterly inefficient school, with fixed conviction that any English verb form containing 'was' is surely passive. The teacher feels, justly, that he has been wasting his own time and that of the better students in an effort, practically without result, to bring the weak student up to the passing mark—of accomplishing more than that he long ago abandoned hope. The executive authority, after foiling an innumerable series of attempts, naive, brazen, or guilefully subtle, to beat the regulations and to secure the palm without the dust of labor may be pardoned for sharing the view of the grievous or resentful student that Latin prose composition is an incubus, a blot on the curriculum. Hence arises a situation, somewhat surprising at first glance, in which the teachers of Latin and the executive authority concur in abolishing prescribed Latin composition, while their scientific colleagues, who have enjoyed in the mental development of the students the results of the toil of the teachers of Latin composition, regret the loss of the course.

To my way of thinking, these teachers of science are not only right in regretting the passing of the assistance they derived from that source, but justified in expecting and demanding it. Latin composition should not be a privilege of those only who expect to carry on to a considerable extent the study of the Classics, although such students are undeniably less trying to teach. Any student whose mental caliber justifies coming to college at all as a candidate for the bachelor's degree is perfectly good material, under proper conditions, for a freshman course in Latin prose composition.

From a study of the school reports and entrance records of the 'lame ducks' of prescribed freshman prose and from personal inquiry and observation it has become evident that the sources of trouble for

students in such a prescribed course may be grouped under two general categories, to wit, defective preparation before entrance to college and unfortunate conditions within the college itself. Of the two, the former is probably the more largely operative. The reports show an astonishing number of students who have had no training whatever in Latin composition in the schools beyond that afforded by a beginning Latin book in the first year of their contact with the language. Many more have had only the most desultory and unsystematic training, scattered at intervals through their preparatory course, or else have been the victims of an attempt to 'cram' the necessary information (that something more than information is needed seems not to have occurred to them) in a much shorter period than even the five weeks which Dr. Mitchell condemns. The result of any of these types of defective preparation is easily imagined—a low mark at the entrance examination, a conviction on the part of the candidate and his parents that Latin prose is maliciously designed for the sole purpose of hampering a student's progress, and one more jar to the executive machinery of the college. This state of affairs arises more frequently in connection with Latin prose than with other subjects because parents, guardians and teachers will send boys and girls up for examination in Latin prose with a 'preparation' which they would never dream of considering adequate in any other subject. They would not expect a pupil who had gone no further than the elementary operations in algebra to pass an examination in 'quadratics and beyond', and, if they did send up a candidate who had tried to cover the whole ground in two weeks, or even two months, they would not be surprised at his failure to pass, nor would they charge such failure against the subject as a proof of its unreasonable and futile character.

Many freshmen enter College, then, conditioned in Latin prose, and convinced that in the condition they possess a grievance rather than a defect. If, in this state of mind, they are subjected within the College to conditions such as I have seen exist, conditions where the number of students under the charge of a single instructor rendered impossible not only individual attention to each student, but even any attempt at recitation by members of the class—where, in short, the course became, of necessity, a lecture course, attended by written exercises, to be examined in large masses and criticised in general terms—it is little wonder that their distaste for Latin composition and disbelief in its value are intensified.

The student gets no help from the lectures, he does not understand the corrections on his papers, his condition hangs on term after term. He feels that the course is not justifying itself because it does not teach him to pass off the condition. He

does not understand that he gets no help from the lectures *because* he has never really learned the things he needs in order to pass the entrance examination and so qualify to understand the lectures. Even where, by dint of looking up every form in the allotted exercise, and by shrewd guessing at the model to be followed among the 'examples' in his text-book, joined to an occasional glimmer of comprehension of what the instructor is talking about, he contrives to raise his term mark enough to balance a bad examination and to squeeze out of the course, it is quite possible for him to continue flunking an entrance examination where no prepared work supplements or corrects its results, and so fail to escape from the shadow of his entrance condition. This state of affairs looks very queer to the student, to his parents, and to the executive authorities aforesaid. They are all sure that something is wrong, and that the something must be prescribed Latin prose. Add to all this the fact that in such large and heterogeneous classes as I have described the instructor must choose between boring the really fit students and abandoning the attempt to help the unfit, and that he generally adopts a compromise which satisfies neither the fit nor the unfit nor himself, and we can readily understand the concurrence of that instructor in a proposal to abolish prescribed Latin prose composition.

True, there is a palliative measure possible—the sectioning of the class to do away with the curse of numbers, and sectioning on a basis of proficiency to cure the heterogeneity. This helps, but fails to heal. What the 'tail-enders' need is preparatory work, pure and simple. To give them that, and then credit them with having completed freshman prose is obviously unfair, whereas to push them through the necessary preparatory work and the proper freshman work in addition is impossible. Again, a compromise is inevitably adopted, with the usual unsatisfactory results.

What, then, is to be done?

Undoubtedly, if all preparatory work could be governed by the principles laid down in Dr. Mitchell's paper, the problem would not exist. Our freshmen would come to us ready for freshman prose. But that happy solution is unlikely. The spectacle of a class in prescribed freshman prose in which about 30 per cent were conditioned, about 10 per cent had an entrance mark of less than 45 is much more apt to occur. Taken in a mass, that class presents a really hopeless problem. Sectioned on a proficiency basis it can be handled fairly well in the better sections, though even these are apt to feel the drag of the instructor's desire to keep the two ends of the class near enough together to justify calling it a class. The true remedy is to refuse to the heavily conditioned students admission to the course, and then to section on a profi-

ciency basis, allowing not more than fifteen in a section, and assigning sufficient credit to the course to justify three or four hours of preparation on each weekly exercise. With sections of that size, containing only students who have attained a grade of at least 50 at entrance, the bugaboos of Latin prose composition vanish, for both pupil and instructor.

What is to become of those who fall below 50 at entrance examination? Well, if the College feels responsible for them, if it feels that it must give them an opportunity to get rid of the condition, it should surely provide that opportunity in some way that will not cripple the legitimate work of the freshman class. One thing is certain—that such students will feel much less entitled to a grievance against the College if they are squarely shut out of the course until their condition is removed, whether other provision is made for them or not, than they do when they are admitted and kept dragging along at the condition, term after term.

But what about those students who do other things well enough but are constitutionally unable to do Latin prose? The answer is that there are no such students. Only two things are necessary in order to proceed to a profitable contact with Latin composition; one is a knowledge of the ordinary forms of the language, and the other is the ability to think straight, or approximately so. A student who has not sufficient memory to learn the forms will find that lack of memory a bar to success in many other subjects, and the student whose inability to think straight makes Latin composition a hopeless muddle will find many other problems of College and of life assuming the same aspect.

If, then, the teachers of the Classics and the wielders of executive authority in Colleges will but recognize the true source of the terrors and entanglements associated with prescribed Latin prose composition, and direct their efforts to the stopping of those sources, if they will impress upon those who control the ante-collegiate career of the student the necessity of at least approximately adequate preparation in this subject (nothing enforces such a necessity more than a history of failures to 'get in' due to lack of the preparation), if, in a word, they will protect the course from impossible material, and then see that the work goes on under proper conditions of limited sections and an equitable allotment of credits—if they will steadfastly do all this, they will find most of the reasons for their own half-hearted or wholly lacking support of prescribed Latin prose removed, and their courage to resist the pressure of the merely lazy or essentially incompetent correspondingly increased.

That pressure must be resisted if we are to save for the student not primarily a classicist, just at the point where its results increase most rapidly in proportion to the effort employed, this efficient

means of developing, as Dr. Mitchell puts it, "reasoning power, memory, judgment, invention and resourcefulness". Much that Dr. Mitchell says of the study of Latin prose in preparatory schools is doubly true of the same study carried into the college course. As the work becomes more intensive, as the student grows more fit to learn whole truths and less satisfied with half truths, as he reads more Latin from a more mature point of view, above all, as he begins to work not only for correct syntax but for some measure of style and idiomatic expression as well, he wins in ever increasing proportion the reward of those by-products of Latin composition which are infinitely more valuable than is even the brightest student's slight skill in composition itself. These by-products Dr. Mitchell sums up (page 27) as follows: "Skill in reading Latin, accuracy in reasoning, directness and clearness of expression in English, and a *knowledge of the relation, proportion, and logical position of the parts of discourse—word, phrase, clause*—that nothing else can give".

I have italicized some words in the quotation because they come close to one result of studying Latin prose which seems to me never to have been sufficiently emphasized. Many will understand readily enough that the study of Latin prose will help in the reading of Latin and in the writing of English, but few will notice, unless their attention is called to the matter, how much it helps in the reading and hearing of English, in swiftness of comprehension and in keenness of enjoyment. There is nothing like handling for oneself, however amateurishly, the tools of a craft to bring appreciation of the mastercraftsman's work or correct judgment of the bungler's makeshift. Doubtless some, while admitting this fact, would contend that the tools handled should be English tools, as more easily obtainable and just as good. The trouble is, they are not as good—largely because they *are* more easily obtainable. In Latin the amateur workman gets his tools by finding out what he can do with each, one by one. He has to find that out before he can use the tool. In English he uses many of them instinctively, therefore uncomprehendingly, and all lie ready to his hand for careless or clumsy or reckless manipulation. It is only when he recognizes in them the same instruments whose true nature and power he has learned in Latin composition that he appreciates and respects them as he should, whether using them himself or watching their use by others. Thus indirectly through English composition, as well as directly, Latin composition sharpens the student's comprehension and enjoyment of English.

At this point again we may encounter an objection from those who admit that exercise in writing a foreign language is needed, but insist that a modern language should be chosen as *more* prac-

tical and just as good for this purpose. But, again, it is not as good. Composition work in a modern language is never as intensive as it is in Latin. In so far as the modern language more nearly approaches English it approaches also the defects of English as a means to this particular end. It is just because Latin is an ancient language, a fixed language (in the classical norm, at least) and a highly inflected language that it serves this purpose so well. It is ancient enough to give the student some perspective of historical grammar, it is fixed enough to serve as a point of departure and comparison, it is highly inflected enough to make him realize the firm framework which has become overlaid by the plastic covering of modern speech. Above all, it is definite, direct, precise. The editor of *The Nation* in a recent address, after stating that of the thousands of manuscripts submitted to him those produced by authors with a classical training were noticeably superior not only in finish and form but in the soundness of the thought itself, expressed his conviction that this superiority sprang from the authors' contact with the writings of great men who were *compelled* by the language in which they wrote to write clearly. That is it. You *may* write clearly in English, in French, in German—you *must* write clearly in Latin if you write at all (so too in Greek, as Dr. Rouse pointed out in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.17). And to write clearly in Latin what someone else has written in English, you must first determine exactly what the English sentences—vocabulary and syntax—mean.

My pupils had occasion recently to render in Latin the word 'safe'. In choosing between *incolumis* and *tutus* they discovered for the first time that the English word meant more than one thing. They seemed to find it a pleasing discovery, and straightway took that word *safe* in hand, scrutinized it minutely, tested it thoroughly and set it down at last with a satisfied nod. Practically every lesson brings up some such matter of vocabulary, many words proving far more interesting than the one cited, and I know it awakens a curiosity about words in general, a tendency to probe for their exact and various meanings, which cannot help adding a new zest and understanding to the reading of English.

In the field of syntax, too, the same sort of thing happens. To take a long, loose, ramshackle English sentence, to determine the interrelations, temporal and logical, of the thoughts of its various clauses and to express those relations in the cunningly articulated structure of a Latin period is an exercise not only delightful in itself, but fraught with happy consequences in an added power to savor the joys of deft fabric in fine English or to pluck the real meaning from less skillful sentences. Balance, antithesis, asyndeton, chiasmus, to name but a few of the simpler and more common arrange-

ments, have their full and true value in English for one who has used them however haltingly in Latin composition. I do not mean that he recognizes them by name, consciously and deliberately. When he reads, "He broke his coronation oath, but he took his little son upon his knee and kissed him", he does not say 'Yes, that is a balanced antithesis—I wrote something like that in Latin', but he does possess the meaning, he does experience the effect which Macaulay intended, with an immediateness, an absence of effort not to be otherwise enjoyed.

Doubtless many who would admit that years of practice in Latin writing, resulting in real proficiency, might give this perception of values in English would still be skeptical concerning such a claim for work of freshman grade. But it is precisely at this stage that this particular gift is granted most generously. The preparatory work scarcely reaches it, and advanced work, while constantly adding to it, lacks something of the initial impetus, the tingle of discovery.

It is true that the Latin sentences and paragraphs produced by the freshmen are still "not, as a product, worth six cents", but the production of them has brought a boon not to be measured in money. The relation between the objective achievement and the subjective gain is always illustrated to my mind by my experience in music. Up to my fifteenth year I had heard very little music of any sort. I could recognize familiar melodies, I liked a song if the words were interesting, and I liked a brass band. But I could not sing, I could not carry a tune. I can't yet. But when I went away to school a friend to whom I shall never cease to be grateful induced me to take some lessons in singing. The effort and sacrifice they cost have been royally repaid. I have learned to hear music, though I shall never make any myself. Doubtless much listening to good music, with proper explanations by a musician, would have helped me to hear, but it would have taken a long time and would not have accomplished the same end. The beauty of a single perfect tone, the marvellous significance of musical phrasing, the emotional quality of a cadence, the satisfying complexity of a fugue, the wealth of orchestral or choral harmonies, all these joys, precious beyond measuring, came to be mine out of those hours over the most elementary exercises and the simplest songs. Those hard-won lessons never made it possible for me to sing, but they did make it possible for me to count as one of the great and abiding happinesses of my life the hearing of the Ninth Symphony of Beethoven.

Just so a freshman course in Latin prose, though it produces no great writers, is still one gateway to beauty and happiness, a gateway which I would not only keep open for all candidates for the bachelor's degree, but into which I would resolutely thrust them as soon as they have mounted the steps

that lead to it. For they do not know, themselves, what lies beyond that gateway, and most of them will miss it if they are not helped.

BARNARD COLLEGE.

GRACE GOODALE.

### REVIEWS

Companion to Roman History. By H. Stuart Jones. Oxford: The Clarendon Press (1912). Pp. xii + 472. \$5.00.

In the preface Mr. Jones states that he has confined his field to subjects which can be illustrated from material remains, and has excluded those which may be adequately studied in manuals unprovided with illustrations. The book contains eight chapters of such subjects. The first and introductory chapter deals with the prehistoric peoples of Italy (with a map showing where remains of their settlements have been found); Roman surveying, and the development of the land and town system; roads and road-making, and sea-routes. This last section on Roman roads with the map to illustrate it is most excellent and might well be made into a separate chapter. In this first chapter there are some obscurities resulting from trying to cover a large amount of material briefly (compare the accounts of the development of Rome and Pompeii), and some statements which are open to question. On page 35 is one: "But if Rome thus began to vie with the great centres of the Hellenistic world (whose wealth it was rapidly draining)", etc.; if this refers to the second century B.C., as it seems to do, it is doubtful whether the Romans were then rapidly draining the wealth of the world. Inscriptions from Delos show that the Southern Italians had control of Mediterranean trade in the second century B.C. and well down into the first.

The other chapters deal with Architecture, War, Religion, Production and Distribution, Money, Public Amusements and Art. Of these the longest chapter is that on architecture. It is divided into numerous heads such as Materials and Methods of Construction; Walls, Towers, Gates, and Bridges; Temples; Fora, Basilicae, etc.; Triumphal Arches; Baths; Theatres, Amphitheatres, and Circi; Public Libraries; Aqueducts, Sewers and Drainage-works; Harbours; The Town House; The Country House; Tombs. This elaborate subdivision is found in all the chapters, thus making the account continuous, and yet separate enough for ready reference. The information is accurate, and is grouped in such a way that a particular subject may be referred to without reading a whole chapter. In general the book is an excellent reference-book for all the subjects it contains. There are some defects, but they are neither many nor serious. In the chapter on Architecture there is an unnecessary amount of archaeological detail, such as isolated measurements of parts of temples; and the same criticism

might be made of the section on Roman Camps. In the chapter on Religion it seems strange that no mention is made of the Jewish and the Christian religions, seeing that those of Cybele, Isis, and Mithra are discussed. There is an error in the statement on page 310, that "... in 129 B.C. we hear of protective measures on behalf of the Italian vine-grower", etc. The order issued at that time by the Roman government was a particular instance and was issued more to please the city of Marseilles, with which Rome had just made a treaty, than for any protection of Roman vine-growers (compare American Historical Review, January, 1913, page 237, Mercantilism and Rome's Foreign Policy). The list of trades included in the chapter on Production is confined very largely to those of Rome; a list of trades outside of Rome and an account of some typical trade *Collegia* would be a welcome addition.

To each topic is appended a short bibliography which is "to direct the reader who desires to make a further study to fuller sources of information". The list is made up for the most part of standard books; where, however, the results of recent investigation have not found their way into manuals, the reference is to periodical literature. The book is splendidly illustrated with eighty plates and sixty-five figures. There are seven maps, all of which are good; the best, possibly, are those of the German *limes* and that showing the roads and the sea-routes.

The book has the attractive appearance usual to Oxford publications, but the pages could have been made more attractive if they had not been so crowded. In some cases a change of topic is not clearly marked (compare e.g. page 151, where the subject changes from aqueducts to sewers).

But there is one vital defect to such a book, a defect not so much in the book as in the limited field chosen by Mr. Jones. It is not clear why he chose the particular subjects or why he should feel that he must confine himself to subjects which can be illustrated from material remains. A handbook in any field should be an accurate, concise, and convenient reference-book for all subjects usually met with in that particular field, if it is to meet the needs of a student. The fewer subjects contained the less its value. A complete handbook in one volume is impossible, but several more subjects could be treated in a book of reasonable size, as Sandys's *Companion to Latin Studies* shows. In a reference-book for Roman history there should be a discussion of philosophy as well as of religion, of weights and measures as well as of money. The calendar deserves a place; there should be a chapter on law, and on municipal and colonial systems. Various other topics would be valuable and would not crowd the volume too much—topics such as Roman education, palaeography, Roman daily life. A brief sketch of writers on Roman history from